

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I wish to make a few comments on the bill. First, let me commend Chairman DORGAN and Senator BENNETT for their excellent work, not only on this legislation but also on the Recovery Act that was passed a few months ago.

Both bills apply significant money to deal with issues and infrastructure that are so important, that would promote green jobs, alternative energy and energy efficiency. They have done an extraordinary job, and I wish to thank them personally.

There is one issue I do want to address, though, and that is the issue of weatherization. In the Recovery Act, there was \$5 billion for weatherization. That is now flowing out to the States, localities. We are going to see, particularly in the next few weeks or months, an increase in activity which is going to put people to work and also to, in the long run, curb our use of energy.

This was a major accomplishment. I know Senator DORGAN and Senator BENNETT were key to getting it included in the Recovery Act. The bill we have before us now includes a very small amount, in my view—I am a proponent of weatherization—for weatherization.

Essentially, the President asked for \$220 million, the bill has \$130 million and two \$35 million pilot projects. But one of the aspects of the decrease from \$200 million to \$130 million is that every State will get a haircut, if you will. Rhode Island, for example, would have, if it was \$200 million, \$350,000 more to spend on weatherization.

Going forward with the weatherization money from the Recovery Act, this might be something we can bridge this year. But if we do not return to a base of at least \$200 million, we are going to see severe disruptions going forward.

The \$350,000 seems like a small sum. But my State has a 12-percent unemployment rate. Any money that can be used, particularly since we have geared up this program for the Recovery Act, would put people to work and would be deeply appreciated. This issue is the same for many other States. New York, they would lose \$6 million; Michigan, \$4 million; Maine, \$1 million; Nevada, \$300,000; all across the States.

I would hope we could have met the President's objective of \$220 million. But one of the other issues is that \$70 million for this funding was carved out for a pilot program. I would hope that, again, if we are doing pilot programs, we could not go after the basic weatherization fund but find them elsewhere to initiate these pilots.

One of the pilots is basically to demonstrate energy savings through the use of insulating and sealing homes built before 1980. There are many individuals and organizations that question whether this is a pilot program that is worthy of \$35 million or so.

One of the things it does is undercut the notion that the whole house should

be weatherized, that there is no magic of just insulating, there are windows, there are door jams, there are energy-efficient appliances. All these things should be considered. So a single, one-dimensional approach raises question with many of the organizations that are actively engaged in weatherization.

For these reasons and more—in fact, I will mention one more that is critical, which is that, under the law, these homes that are insulated would be ineligible for additional weatherization, for weatherization treatment. That is sort of one bite at the apple.

As a result, they would not be able to perhaps be more efficiently weatherized in the future. So I think that is something that has to be considered. As a result, the National Association for State Community Services Programs, the National Community Action Foundation, both of them have written with concerns about this proposal.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter from these two groups.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. REED. We originally, Senator SNOWE and I, filed an amendment to see if we could restore the funding. But I think at this moment, what we want to see is this bill move forward to conference. I would love to work with the chairman and the ranking member on this issue. Also, I would expect that if these pilot projects for this year are fully evaluated, that next year, we take another hard and close look, if we cannot resolve it in conference, on the use of these funds for pilot programs.

Finally, again, we are fortunate because of the work of Senators DORGAN and Senator BENNETT that we have a significant amount of weatherization money through the Recovery Act. But, again, I think we should have to insist that we maintain a good base fund, and I would hope we could do that going forward.

I yield the floor.

#### EXHIBIT 1

Hon. DANIEL INOUE,  
*Chairman, U.S. Senate Committee on Appropriations, Hart Senate Office Building, Washington, DC.*

Hon. BYRON DORGAN,  
*Chairman, Subcommittee on Energy and Water Development, U.S. Senate Committee on Appropriations, Hart Senate Office Building, Washington, DC.*

DEAR CHAIRMAN INOUE AND CHAIRMAN DORGAN: The National Association for State Community Services Programs (NASCSPP) represents the state administrators of the Weatherization Assistance Program and the National Community Action Foundation (NCAF) represents the local Community Action Agencies that deliver the program's services. We are very concerned about the language in the FY 2010 Committee Report, which allocates \$70 million for alternative and vaguely specified uses to be determined by the Department of Energy. Those funds could be used to weatherize nearly 11,000 low-income homes. The disappointing appropriations level of \$200 million itself is only 80%

of President Obama's Request. After the funding earmarked for alternative uses is taken away from state allocations, just \$130 million would remain for the core program. This is the lowest program allocation since 1998.

This diversion of funds from the core program suggests the Committee lacks confidence in the burgeoning expansion of Weatherization service delivery. We believe such fears are not supported by the facts as laid out in the multi-year plans recently approved for state Program growth under the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 (ARRA). Many states even plan to complete ARRA-funded work before the end of FY 2010 and are counting on the 'regular', appropriated funds to prevent the collapse of the program and moderate the loss of its workforce.

Further, we question the value of both of the alternative, federally-run projects to be funded. One tests insulation in older homes. Older homes already make up the vast majority of housing stock weatherized today. Additionally, insulation is just one component of a comprehensive weatherization project. The intent of the program may be to test new insulation materials developed by a manufacturer; in that case, a dedicated program is unnecessary because the core program provides a path for incorporating new technologies and materials. Appendix A to Title 10, Part 440, Direct Final Rule—Federal Register, June 22, 2006, specifies how test results on materials are submitted to DOE technical review and then placed on the approved list. However, if the project is intended to test batt insulation manufacturers' suggestion of an insulation-only program rather than a systematic approach to the house as a system of space conditioning systems and baseload usage, there are better ways. One would be the long-delayed program evaluation of a sample of thousands of homes where some will have received only insulation. Another is to use the evaluations performed on similar experiments conducted by utility DSM programs and to incorporate the results into WAP practices.

The second pilot program, funds "partnerships between the Department and traditional and/or nontraditional weatherization providers" to increase private leveraged funding. In other words the program is intended to act without the states or local agencies that would, in the end, need to test and adopt innovations. It is apparently to be a new, direct federal Weatherization program with new delivery agencies which would circumvent the statutory requirement to use the experienced local network providers. It is not necessary to earmark funding for leveraging activities, as the statute allows substantial investment in activities to leverage private funding; the millions won by Weatherizers in utility rate-payer programs attest to the efficacy and frequency of states' investments in innovative private partnerships.

The Committee Report also suggests there should be a new private funding match requirement for federal funds which is not reflected in the re-authorization bill recently reported by the Energy Committee. We question the practicality of this requirement and believe hearings on the proposal's impact would be appropriate.

Thank you for considering our concerns regarding this matter.

Sincerely,

TIMOTHY R. WARFIELD,  
*Executive Director,  
National Association  
for State Community  
Service Programs.*

DAVID BRADLEY,